

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical mistakes in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Claims 1-2, 4, 11, 17-18 and 23 have been amended to correct minor typographical mistakes in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant submits that the Examiner's objections have been overcome the specification and claims are now in a condition for allowance. Applicant submits no new matter has been added by this Amendment. As such, Applicant requests allowance of the claims.

**Rejection Under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0023111 by Arora in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,858 to Fischer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

With regard to claim 1, and claims depending therefrom, the Arora reference does not teach several elements recited in the claims, including "dividing the image space of the composite image into a plurality of subspaces." The Examiner states that "abstract...and...paragraphs 76-78 and 94" supposedly teach "*selecting and dragging/dropping display elements such as images to their designated subspaces to define a webpage layout,*" but they do not. There is no notion of a "subspace" evident in those paragraphs. Instead, in paragraph 78, Arora makes clear that it provides a:

page draw editor to add text graphics, and other display elements to the page. The user can then rearrange display elements by dragging and dropping them to a new location,

placing the display elements exactly where they will eventually appear with pixel level accuracy.

As such, all Arora teaches is that text and graphics may be placed in the general coordinate space of an entire Web page, but teaches nothing of creating subspaces. In fact, as Arora fails to teach the claimed “subspace” which is obtained from “dividing the image space of the composite image into a plurality,” thus Arora also fails to teach all remaining claims elements of “designating a subspace...” and “resizing the selected image to fit the designated subspace.” The Examiner notes paragraphs 103 and 109 in Arora with regard to “resizing,” but fails to take into account that Arora’s “Size Objects function...sizes display elements” only in the general coordinate space of the entire Web page and not in a subspace. Arora cannot resize images into subspaces because Arora has no notion of a subspace. Arora merely teaches that an image may be resized by a user to have a certain boundary, but it does not resize “the selected image to fit the designated subspace” from a “plurality of subspaces” that were made by “dividing the image space.” Arora teaches no such notion of a subspace receptacle.

Fisher also fails to teach the element of “dividing the image space into a plurality of subspaces.” Fisher does not allow a user to construct a composite image. Fisher simply teaches the loading of a predefined webpage that is unalterable in its construction. The Fisher invention teaches loading a webpage that is a predefined page that cannot be altered or further divided into subspaces. So when the webpage shown in Figure 3 of Fisher is loaded/displayed, it cannot then be divided. That page is static. In fact, Fisher teaches no facility for dividing the displayed webpage, and it will remain as it was predefined because Fisher’s invention is incapable of making divisions to that predefined webpage.

As the element of “dividing the image space of the composite image into a plurality of subspaces” is absent from both Arora and Fisher, and therefore, the cited references fail to teach all the recited elements of the asserted claims. Similarly, rejections regarding claims 14 and 17, and claims depending therefrom, are traversed based on a similar rational as provided above.

Finally, there is no motivation in any of the references to combine the types of activities and/or the noted references. Furthermore, even if the references were to be combined, they would not result in the claimed invention as claimed elements would still be missing for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, the reference(s) cited by the office action do not result in the claimed invention, there was/is no motivation for such a combination of references (i.e., cited references do not teach, read on, suggest, or result in the claimed invention(s)), and the claimed inventions are not admitted to be prior art. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the supporting remarks and claimed inventions, claims 1-39, all: overcome all rejections and/or objections as noted in the office action, are patentable over and discriminated from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests allowance, and reconsideration of the rejection(s) and or objection(s).

### **CONCLUSION**

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4301-4000.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4301-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:

Walter G. Hanchuk  
Registration No. 35,179

Dated: November 8, 2004

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281  
(212) 415-8700 (telephone)  
(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)